

## REMARKS

The Office Action of April 29, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Turning first to the drawing objection, in section 3 of the Office Action, the Substitute Specification (filed December 30, 2004) has been amended to clarify that the number 104 is not a reference number, but rather is part of the tradename of a product "Stripping Solution 104," sold by Tokyo Ohka Kogyo Co., Ltd., which is not shown in the drawings. Accordingly, the drawing objection should be withdrawn.

Section 4 of the Office Action rejects claim 8 for indefiniteness, on the ground that "at edges of the color-converting filters" is unclear. The present Amendment responds to this ground of rejection by revising claim 8 to positively recite that the filters have edges. The Amendment also revises claim 8 to recite that the stress-relieving layer is "patterned to have walls that are disposed at the edges of the color-converting filters...". It is noted that this "walls" terminology is supported by the paragraph at page 14 of the Substitute Specification, line 14 to page 15, line 1. It is respectfully submitted that, with these changes, claim 8 is now suitably definite under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

Section 4 of the Office Action also rejects claims 13 and 14 for indefiniteness, on the ground that "efficient thermal conductor" is not defined.

A paragraph at page 15 of the substitute specification, lines 9-13 refers to a stress-relieving layer having fine carbon particles, and notes the thermal conductivity. Claim 13 has been amended to recite that a stress-relieving layer "has fine particles dispersed therein that promote thermal conductivity," and claim 14 has been amended to recite fine carbon particles that to promote thermal conductivity. In view of the revised claim language, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection for indefiniteness should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects all of the claims for obviousness based on a published international application by Pichler and a US patent by Yamazaki et al. This latter reference will hereafter be called simply "Yamazaki" for the sake of convenient discussion. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action purports to find most of what is recited in claim 1 in the Pichler reference (although the Office Action resorts to different embodiments). However, section 8 of the Office Action acknowledges that Pichler does not disclose that any of his layers are stress-relieving layers. For this, the Office Action turns to the Yamazaki reference.


Yamazaki discloses a buffer layer 32 in Figures 1B and 3B, and a passage noted in the Office Action advises that the buffer layer 32 is formed in order to relieve stress within a protective film 33. The Office Action also refers to a stress-relieving buffer layer 203 in Figure 5A. The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to include Yamazaki's stress relieving layer in Pichler's display.

However, claim 1 now provides that the stress-relieving layer is patterned, so as to have walls that are disposed at the edges of the color-converting filters. Claim 1 now also provides that there are opening between the walls, and adhesive extends into these openings. These features neither disclosed nor suggested by Yamazaki. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the invention now defined by claim 8 would not have been obvious from the references.

The remaining claims depend from claim 8 and recite additional limitations to further define the invention, so they are automatically patentable along with claim 8 and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*for*  29102  
Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.  
Customer No. 23995  
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng

AMENDMENT

10/520,006